

American Opinion Summary

Department of State

Permanent File copy
Do not remove

No. 127

December 11, 1962

CUBA

A number of observers continue to voice concern about the absence of any "ground verification" of the complete removal of Soviet offensive weapons from Cuba. As the President himself "has repeatedly said," Time magazine declares, "such on-site inspection is the only way the U.S. can really be sure."

"If there is any doubt that on-the-spot inspection is vitally necessary," the New York Mirror maintains, "it can be dispelled by the fact that the 42 bombers observed returning to Russia are more than the U.S. knew were in Cuba." The Herald Tribune remarks, "there is no guaranty whatever that more of them are not still there," adding: the "aerial surveillance we must continue to rely on has never been satisfactory."

Sen. Russell (D-Ga.) holds that the U.S. erred in lifting the Cuban quarantine before "we had the right of on-site inspection throughout Cuba" (also Cincinnati Enquirer, Marguerite Higgins). The Hearst papers insist that the U.S. "is not bound by any 'no-invasion' pledge until the Soviet has lived up to every last detail of its promises."

Some fear the inspection issue has become one of "long, dragged-out" negotiation (e.g., Gould Lincoln, David Lawrence, Edward V. Rickenbacker, Spruille Braden, National Review). "Khrushchev is reneging on his promise," charges the New York News, "and the White House up to now is letting him get away with that renege." Sen. Keating (R-N.Y.) urges that "we should act promptly to demand and if necessary enforce an effective form of on-site inspection."

But others see no "lowering of our guard" despite the delay in inspection agreement. The U.S. is still pressing for on-site inspection, and the continuing reconnaissance over-flights in Cuba will give "ample warning" of any Russo-Cuban military build up, say the Los Angeles Times and Boston Herald.

The Chicago News holds that "in the long run, Castro could be the loser of his adamant stand against inspection. Had he permitted it, he would have had a U.S. guarantee against invasion" (similarly, Max Lerner in N.Y. Post).